



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/335,268	06/17/1999	JOHN S. HENDRICKS	5263	6270

7590 02/24/2005

JOHN K HARROP
DOSEY & WHITNEY LLP
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE
SUITE 300 SOUTH
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER

PAULA, CESAR B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/335,268

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS, JOHN S.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10,30-39 and 59-73 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-29 and 40-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 June 1999 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the restriction response filed on 7/20/2004.
2. In the response, claims 11-29, and 40-58 have been elected, and are pending in the case. Claims 11, 13, 20, 28, 40, 42, 49, and 57 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 9/22/2000 has been entered, and considered by the examiner.

Priority

4. Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 120 is acknowledged cip of 08/160281, filed on 12/2/93.

Drawings

5. The drawings filed on 6/17/1999 have been approved by the examiner.

Art Unit: 2178

Claim Objections

6. Claims 20-27 are objected to because of the following informalities: "a portion the electronic book" lines 3-4. This would be better written as "a portion of the electronic book" Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 11-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
9. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the subscriber" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. There is no previous "subscriber" to refer in this claim.
10. All the independent claims have the same deficiency as claim 11, therefore, are similarly rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2178

12. Claims 11-13, 15-23, 25-29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas et al, hereinafter Lucas (Pat. # 5,499,330, 3/12/96, filed on 9/17/93), in view of Cassorla et al, hereinafter Cassorla (Pat. # 5,146,552, 9/8/92, filed on 2/28/90).

Regarding independent claim 1, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request for simultaneously displaying at least a portion of any plurality of pages* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Regarding claim 12, which depends on claim 11, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, using a pile and scroll graphical bar (col.10, lines 52-60, fig.3)

Regarding independent claim 13, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least one page --* for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7).

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Claim 15 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 12, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 16, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced.

Regarding claim 17, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced.

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects are detected and those that are displayed in the foreground are magnified, and the document objects in the background are reduced.

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of document objects or pieces of paper in a screen(col.10, lines 29-50). In other words, the document objects that are moved—*detecting change--*, and then displayed as commanded by the user, such as the moving or formatting of entire strands of documents.

Regarding independent claim 20, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a portion and content from an information source --* for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7).

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Claim 21 is directed towards a method for implementing the steps found in claim 12, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 20, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, such as scanned documents—*inset image*-- on a screen or viewer (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7, fig.3-4).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 22, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of the document objects or pieces of paper in a screen(col.10, lines 29-50).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the displaying of document objects or pieces of paper in a tiled fashion—*side-by-side* (col.10, lines 29-67, fig. 3-4).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*reversing a position of the displayed portion*.

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 20, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*receiving a video signal as the content from the information source* to display the document objects as commanded by the user.

Regarding independent claim 28, Lucas discloses the display of multiple documents, such as scanned documents—*inset image*-- on a screen or viewer. A user assigns various separation and formatting constraints—*receiving a request from the subscriber for displaying at least a page and content from an information source* -- for defining parent-child relationships among the documents (col. 1, lines 49-col.2, line 7).

Art Unit: 2178

Moreover, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner, from a pile of document objects—*information source* (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.1, 3-4). In other words, the document objects are displayed, and formatted simultaneously as commanded by the user. The user tiles the document pages in a U-shaped configuration, thereby uncovering background documents hidden documents in the foreground—*display a portion of the page otherwise concealed by the inset image*. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *an electronic book*. However, Cassorla teaches the highlighting, and annotating electronic books (col.3, lines 7-35). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, and Cassorla, because Lucas teaches the organization of documents in an intuitive way (col. 1, lines 31-54). This would provide the benefit of allowing a user to read the electronic book in a more effective fashion using a display method that is more intuitive.

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 28, Lucas teaches the moving, and displaying of the document objects, such as scanned images or pieces of paper in a screen(col. 1, lines 50-54, col.10, lines 29-50). In other words, the image and the document object is moved to a new location by the user, and displayed by the computer.

Claims 40-42, 44-52, and 54-58 are directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claims 11-13, and 15-23, 25-29 respectively, and therefore are similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

13. Claims 14, and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas, in view of Cassorla, and further in view of Barnes, "10 Minute Guide to Windows 3.1, Alpha Books, 1992, pp.60-64.

Regarding claim 14, which depends on claim 13, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, multiple document objects are displayed simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *formatting the page for display on three screens*. However, Barnes teaches copying, and pasting information between windows of the same or different applications (page 63, lines 23-page 64). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Barnes, because Barnes teaches copying and pasting information from one window to another window. This would provide the benefit of allowing to reuse the same information, without the time-consuming task of recreating the same information.

Claim 43 is directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claim 14, and therefore is similarly rejected.

14. Claims 24, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lucas, in view of Cassorla, and further in view of Levine et al, hereinafter Levine (Pat. # 5,625,833, 4/29/97, continuation filed on 4/7/93).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 22, Lucas teaches the display of document objects or pieces of paper in a U-shaped manner (col.10, lines 44-col.11, line 39, fig.3-4). In other words, multiple document objects are displayed simultaneously as commanded by the user. Lucas fails to explicitly disclose: *wrapping around the displayed content from the information source*. However, Levine teaches automatically wrapping a word to the next line, when a typing cursor comes close by (col.17, lines 66-col.18, line 12). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Lucas, Cassorla, and Levine, because teaches above automatically aligning the text in accordance to pre-established margins. This has the benefit of allowing the whole document to remain in the document, and user to view the whole document.

Claim 53 is directed towards an apparatus for implementing the steps found in claim 24, and therefore is similarly rejected.

Art Unit: 2178

Conclusion

I. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. McTaggart (Pat. # 5,417,575 5,484,292), and Yamazaki et al. (Pat. # 5,475,398).

II. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- (703) 703-872-9306, (for all Formal communications intended for entry)



**CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

2/22/05